RECEIVED

AUG 1 2 1996

From:

Terrie <terrie@calvin.spiff.net>

To: Date: A16.A16(rm8775) 8/9/96 9:07pm

Subject:

RM No. 8775

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIO

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am writing because I think that the telephone companies should not have a say on what I do with my internet connection. I read the petition and I totally disagree with it. My carrier is NOT going broke because I use an internet phone program. I still pay over \$200 in long distance charges and telephone service every single month. If anything, the FCC should force telephone companies to lower their long distance rates.

No. of Copies rec'd_ List ABCDE

Bradley Custer <BradCuster@gnn.com=DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL CEIVED
A20.A20(kwerbach) From: A20.A20(kwerbach) To: 8/10/96 11:29pm Date: AUG 1 2 1996 Subject: Fwd: ACTA Mar 4,96 Petition FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIC OFFICE OF SECRETARY >Date: Sat, 10 Aug 1996 23:24:25 >From: BradCuster@gnn.com (Bradley Custer) rm8775@fcc.gov >To: **ACTA Mar 4,96 Petition** >Subject: >Dear FCC: >I would like to respond NEGATIVLEY toward the ACTA >Petition of March 4, 1996. >I hope that discussion regarding this petition has not >ended yet, because I do not see how Internet-Phone >software reatailers can be in any way regarded comparable >or in need of the same regualtions as telephony corporations. >I will explain: Telephony corporations provide a pay-per-use >service which must be maintained with constant human-hours, >Internet-Phone companies DO NOT provide any such service. >Internet-Phone companies are nothing more than software >producers and retailers. Hence, THEY CAN NOT BE SUBJECT >TO LAWS WRITTEN FOR SERVICE PROVIDING COMPANIES. >Furthermore, a company does not have to be the only means >whereby citizens can take advantage of voice-communication >via the Internet. Any intellegent programmer can produce a >similar program, hence private creativity would be STIFFLED >if a ban where placed upon Internet-Phone software. >I would like to respond to the one plausable arguement >in made in the ACTA's March 4 Petition - that the use of >digital voice exchange software on the Internet would >undermine the reveune of the industry which provides the >possibility of the Internet; making the possibility of >eventuating the Internet's colapse. >This arguement seems plausable, yet I feel it is flawed for lack >of forsight - and I will explain why. >First, any colapse would only be possible at a highly advanced >stage of Internet use by a MUCH larger public segment and the great >inhancement of digital voice exchange software. >Second, if a stage in the future where to come where the Internet >was used as commonly as telephone use itself, then a drastically >different telecommunications infrastructure would be desired and >likewise progressive means of reveune generation would become >more intellegent then those being currently used. >In other words if the telecommunications future holds the >replacement of the telephone by Internet assisted more automated >facilities then changes will need to be made to compensate for >that state of affairs anyway. >Hence, stiffling the use and producition of Internet-Phone software >at this point is NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST, and will only serve >to complicate and disrupt the natural evolution of our >telecommunications infrastructre. >Thank you for your consideration, >Bradley Custer No. of Copies rec'd

List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From:

Bradley Custer < BradCuster@gnn.com>

To: Date: A16.A16(rm8775) 8/10/96 11:24pm

Subject:

ACTA Mar 4,96 Petition

AUG 1 2 1996

RECEIVED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIC OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear FCC:

I would like to respond NEGATIVLEY toward the ACTA Petition of March 4, 1996.

I hope that discussion regarding this petition has not ended yet, because I do not see how Internet-Phone software reatailers can be in any way regarded comparable or in need of the same regualtions as telephony corporations.

I will explain: Telephony corporations provide a pay-per-use service which must be maintained with constant human-hours.

Internet-Phone companies DO NOT provide any such service.

Internet-Phone companies are nothing more than software producers and retailers. Hence, THEY CAN NOT BE SUBJECT

TO LAWS WRITTEN FOR SERVICE PROVIDING COMPANIES.

Furthermore, a company does not have to be the only means whereby citizens can take advantage of voice-communication via the Internet. Any intellegent programmer can produce a similar program, hence private creativity would be STIFFLED if a ban where placed upon Internet-Phone software.

I would like to respond to the one plausable arguement in made in the ACTA's March 4 Petition - that the use of digital voice exchange software on the Internet would undermine the reveune of the industry which provides the possibility of the Internet; making the possibility of eventuating the Internet's colapse.

This arguement seems plausable, yet I feel it is flawed for lack of forsight - and I will explain why.

First, any colapse would only be possible at a highly advanced stage of Internet use by a MUCH larger public segment and the great inhancement of digital voice exchange software.

Second, if a stage in the future where to come where the Internet was used as commonly as telephone use itself, then a drastically different telecommunications infrastructure would be desired and likewise progressive means of reveune generation would become more intellegent then those being currently used.

In other words if the telecommunications future holds the replacement of the telephone by Internet assisted more automated facilities then changes will need to be made to compensate for that state of affairs anyway. Hence, stiffling the use and producition of Internet-Phone software at this point is NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST, and will only serve to complicate and disrupt the natural evolution of our telecommunications infrastructre.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bradley Custer

No. of Copies rec'd______List ABCDE